

EXHIBIT J

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
Plaintiff,
vs. No. CV 10-03561 WHA
GOOGLE INC.,
Defendant.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JAMES KOLOTOUROS
Palo Alto, California
Tuesday, January 26, 2016
Volume I

Reported by:
CATHERINE A. RYAN
CSR No. 8239
Job No. 2224276
PAGES 1 - 232

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 MR. RAGLAND: Objection. Form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I do give input into the</p> <p>3 strategy.</p> <p>4 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>5 Q What is the strategy that Google is</p> <p>6 currently considering?</p> <p>7 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: We are currently considering</p> <p>9 offering search revenue shares to more OEMs.</p> <p>10 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>11 Q Why is Google considering offering search</p> <p>12 revenue shares to more OEMs?</p> <p>13 A The current -- several of the OEMs are not</p> <p>14 necessarily doing very well in the hyper competitive</p> <p>15 smartphone industry, and I think that we want to</p> <p>16 show our support of their participation in Android</p> <p>17 by introducing search revenue-share agreements as</p> <p>18 they struggle more now than they had in the past,</p> <p>19 and search revenue share is the vehicle for that</p> <p>20 effort.</p> <p>21 Q Do you have an understanding as to why the</p> <p>22 OEMs are not currently doing well?</p> <p>23 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form. Beyond</p> <p>24 the scope of the noticed topics.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I think it's a very</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 different number from us before.</p> <p>2 Q I'll hand you a document that's previously</p> <p>3 been marked as Exhibit 5099. And I believe this is</p> <p>4 a document that you mentioned refreshed your</p> <p>5 recollection while you were preparing for today's</p> <p>6 deposition.</p> <p>7 A That is correct.</p> <p>8 Q If I could direct your attention to the</p> <p>9 page that ends in number -31. Is it correct that at</p> <p>10 least at the time that this document was drafted</p> <p>11 Google was contemplating a deal with Lenovo where</p> <p>12 Google would have -- would share 16 percent of gross</p> <p>13 revenue with Lenovo?</p> <p>14 A That is --</p> <p>15 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: That is correct.</p> <p>17 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>18 Q And if, as it states on this page, an</p> <p>19 Android-compatible device upgrades at any time</p> <p>20 during the term to the then most current release,</p> <p>21 revenue share will be increased to 20 percent -- do</p> <p>22 you see that?</p> <p>23 A I do.</p> <p>24 Q But if the ACD, which I believe is</p> <p>25 Android-compatible device -- is that correct?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>
<p>1 competitive hardware business.</p> <p>2 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>3 Q Are those OEMs competing with each other?</p> <p>4 MR. RAGLAND: Objection. Form and scope.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe they are.</p> <p>6 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>7 Q So in what way would changing the</p> <p>8 revenue-share percentage change the nature of the</p> <p>9 competitive market for OEMs?</p> <p>10 MR. RAGLAND: Objection to form and scope.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: So it's less a change of</p> <p>12 percentage than an introduction of the search</p> <p>13 revenue-share component for Android devices to these</p> <p>14 OEMs.</p> <p>15 BY MS. LEWIS-GRUSS:</p> <p>16 Q And does Google contemplate that the</p> <p>17 revenue-share percentage to those OEMs would be</p> <p>18 standard across the different OEMs?</p> <p>19 A Notwithstanding prior commitments that had</p> <p>20 been made to the OEM, generally, yes.</p> <p>21 Q What is the revenue-share percentage that</p> <p>22 Google is contemplating offering to those OEMs?</p> <p>23 A Eight percent for -- eight percent.</p> <p>24 Q Is that 8 percent under all circumstances?</p> <p>25 A Notwithstanding them having received a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>	